

tertainments and medical service are free.

They have the advantages of good soil, cheap land, healthy climate and water. The plan seemed to be a great success. I should like to see many such activities controlled and owned by the workers. But these activities have their limits. Our only hope lies in the ownership of the land and tools by the users of the same.—Walter Higgins, 4106 Gladys Av.

STOP FOREIGN COMMERCE.—

After two and one-half years of the European war, from which we had hoped that we were immune because of our isolated location and for other good reasons, we have come to the edge of the fearful precipice. Shall we leap into the hellish chasm? Or will some good angel open our eyes to the utter needlessness of this, and, withal, the fearful consequences of it?

And we had hoped that we could be the kindly mediator between the warring nations!

Isn't it strange that the ethics of nations conflict so strongly with those of individuals?

Apart from the legal liability in the case, a man is frowned upon by his neighbors if he settles his disputes with his fists or a gun.

Well, we have made some advance in civilization: fist fights and duelling are outlawed.

Arbitration and court decrees have proven more effective for the individual than the old methods. This being the case, what logical objection could be presented against their adoption by nations as nations?

War cannot be supported by either logic or justice.

When a man commits a murder he alone is held responsible for the act, unless, of course, he has accomplices.

We do not say to an innocent neighbor of the murderer, "Now, you go after that man and beat him to a pulp or let him grind you to atoms; whoever wins out is justified in the

eyes of the law." No! Just as likely as not the murderer, if a better pugilist than the other, would be "justified in the eyes of the law." And what recompense could be given the innocent victim? It would simply be another murder.

Yet that is just the way that nations set out to settle their differences. Both the nation that is aggrieved and the aggressor set up thousands, perhaps millions of their men, innocent citizens, to be shot if they cannot succeed in killing the other fellows. Whichever side wins out is "justified."

Now, if we should go to war with Germany, I am afraid that it would be the Teutons who would be "justified."

We are in no shape to go to war with any nation, least of all Germany, who is pastmaster in the art of war. We have long known of the possibilities of war, yet we have been industriously shipping to one of the belligerents the arms and ammunition that would be needed in this event.

Pray, what would we fight with, our fists, if our government should plunge us into war?

We must not forget that it would not be necessary for us to declare war; an act of war would serve the same purpose. One of our Illinois senators in speaking of the power that would be given the president in the ship armament bill is thus quoted in one of the Chicago dailies:

"That right exercised is an act of war. I shall vote for the bill, but I want no one to be deluded regarding the responsibilities which it entails. And when I say that I shall vote for the bill I want to say that I will vote for war if that must come in order to preserve our rights and our honor."

A mayor has the right to warn citizens off the streets in time of a riot. What would we think of a "smart aleck" who would insist on his "rights" and persist in mingling